

REMARKS

Claims 110—219 are pending in the above-referenced application. Claims 110, 117-119, 122-125, 143, 167, 186, 193-195, 198-201 have been amended to more distinctly claim that which Applicants regard as their invention. Additionally, new claims 220-221 have been added to recite specific embodiments. The amendments and new claims are supported by the specification. No new matter has been added.

I. The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 117, 118, 122-125 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. It is asserted that the antecedence for "the array" is not clear since numerous arrays are recited.

In response, claims 117, 118 and 122-125 have been amended to more distinctly claim that which Applicants regard as their invention. Claim 117 now depends from claim 116 and claim 118 depends from claim 116. Claim 122-125 depend from claim 121.

~~Claims 143 and 167 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as~~
being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. It is asserted that R7 and R8 are defined differently in different parts of the claims and the scope cannot be clearly determined. In response, claims 143 and 167 have been amended so that R7 and R8 are defined in one place in claims 143 and 167.

In view of the amended claims 117, 118, 122-125, 143 and 167, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph have been overcome. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

II The Rejection of The Claims Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 110-113, 115-119, 122-142, 167-218 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moller. It is asserted that the rejected claims still read on prior art examples cited such as exs. 18, 27 and 51.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, in order to advance prosecution, claims 110, 143, 167 and 185 have been amended to advance prosecution. Applicants do reserve the right to file subsequent continuation and/or divisional applications on the subject matter cancelled in these claims.

In view of the claim amendments, Applicants assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) have been overcome. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance. Early action to that end is respectfully requested. The Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if there are any questions concerning this amendment or application.

Date: 10/8/03

Respectfully submitted,



Cheryl H. Agris, Reg. No. 34,086
Outside Counsel for
Novo Nordisk Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
100 College Road West
Princeton, NJ 08540
609-919-7779